

---

Demetrios G.  
PAPADEMETRIOU

Co-Director  
Migration Policy Institute, USA

DUBROVNIK  
CONFERENCE  
PAPER



Diaspora, once again an important concept in the field of migration, refers to the community that is sometimes formed by one's nationals in another country. Some questions that must be answered when examining what constitutes a diaspora include: How does a diaspora differ from an immigrant group, or does it at all? When does an ethnic group become a diaspora? Is a diaspora viewed as something positive either in the sending or receiving country? What are the interests of the respective countries with regard to a diaspora, and if they differ, in what ways do they do so?

These are among the important questions that we must ask ourselves when analyzing diasporas, diasporic politics, the opportunities that diasporas can create for the sending country, and the notion of emigrant responsibilities toward the sending country. Other questions include: How does the individual become part of a diaspora? Who pays the largest costs when an individual leaves a country? Who should reap the greatest benefits as a result of the act? Why should an individual continue to remain responsible to its sending country? Theoretically speaking, it is very important that we, as an academic community, answer these questions about diasporas and their relationship to sending and receiving countries in order to adequately analyze and make well-informed statements about the concept.

This commentary makes a series of observations regarding emigration, emigrant communities, and the importance of building strong relationships between sending and receiving countries. I propose that many factors, both from the sending and receiving countries, affect the construction of a diaspora. Moreover, the extent to which a diaspora participates in the development of the sending country is examined.

The factors that play a significant role in the construction and role of a diaspora include: the type of migra-

tion experience, the outflow size, the size of the countries in question, how an emigrant community constitutes and organizes itself while abroad, the structure and immigration policies of these countries, and the relationship between the emigrant and immigrant countries.

The conditions and treatment of non-citizens in the receiving country greatly affect how an immigrant group perceives itself in the host community. Canada, for example, views all immigrants as prospective members of society and therefore has created a direct and uncomplicated path through which immigrants can become citizens. In Europe, the process leading to citizenship is neither as direct nor as clear. A diasporic community often times forms when the bond between emigrants and their country of origin is stronger than the bond that forms with their host country. In fact, this suggests that it may be more likely to have a diaspora in Europe than in classic immigration countries.

The migration path that emigrants pursue often has an important effect on the sending country. Emigrants follow many migration paths, such as: legal, illegal, permanent, temporary, skill-based, family reunification-based or the refugee and asylum paths. If a large proportion of emigrants are leaving their country as refugees, we can assume that this country is experiencing some form of conflict. In contrast, if the majority of emigrants enter receiving countries via skilled-based positions, it might suggest that the sending country has already achieved a certain level of development. Whether a diaspora forms as a result of migration, can thus be both predicted and affected by the type of migration. For example, skill-based emigrants may be the least likely set of individuals to view themselves as – or organize – a diaspora. The stage of development of the sending country can thus shape the formation of a diaspora from an emigrant group. The size of the emigrant outflow in relation to the sending country is another significant factor in the creation of a diaspora and ultimately has consequences for the sending country. If a very small country loses 10-20 highly qualified individuals a year, this can have a huge effect on the country's development. Conversely, if a large country with a first class educational system has large numbers of its educated emigrate, such emigration may actually be an asset for the sending country, due to the capital gained through their remittances. The extent of such help, however, may be hard to estimate.

The size of the sending country and the return migration of its successful emigrants is an integral component for the future development of that country. For example,

in a small country like Croatia, having a return migration of 50,000 successful people could have an enormous agglomeration effect on the current population of four and a half million people. In contrast however, a large country like Mexico that has nearly one hundred million people, is not likely to experience the same degree of change even with the return of two million individuals. Therefore, if the sending country is small in population size, the effect of a well-organized diaspora and the return of many of its migrants is much more significant to the sending country and can dramatically affect the rate and type of development it experiences.

How a sending country organizes itself to benefit from migration is another especially important feature in the discussion of diasporas. First, it is important to understand why people migrate. The literature provides us with two broad explanations: survival and mobility. If significant social and political reforms occur during the period of the individual's absence, such changes may encourage the sending of remittances and return migration. When the role of the sending country in the individual emigrant's experience, some important questions include: Does the state relate to its emigrants, and if so, how? What does the state do to attract return migration? The economic development of the country of origin can thus be affected significantly by its connection (or lack thereof) to its emigrant communities.

Finally, the relationship between the sending country and the receiving country can lie at the core of the development of the sending country. Some examples include Canada, the U.S., and Mexico in the context of NAFTA, and the European Union.

Strong relations between sending and receiving countries can create a climate of cooperation rather than conflict. Moreover, close cooperation between sending and receiving countries can lead to financial and structural assistance, thus fostering economic development in the country of origin.

In conclusion, diasporas must be examined through the lens of the emigrant and immigrant countries' specific characteristics and their interests in and actions toward the migrant community. The size of the country itself, the size of the migration movement, the type of movement and the structure and relationship of the sending and receiving countries, all contribute a diaspora's engagement in the country of origin's progress as a state.